

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 8-16, 19, 22-26, 29-37, 40 and 43-47 and 50-63 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 12, 19, 22, 33, 40 and 43 have been amended and new claims 52-63 have been added. Claims 48 and 49 have been canceled. Support for new claims 52-63 can be found, for example, in paragraphs 32-35 and from Figure 4. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 43-51 stand rejected as lacking patentable utility. Applicants disagree. In an aspect of the present invention, database records which are separately maintained, yet which may be initially derived from the same transaction or data set, can be reviewed and reconciled to correct errors which may occur over time. As an example, paragraph 3 of the present application states the following:

One goal of the reconciliation process may be to identify data in one subset that does not reconcile with data in another subset, even though both subsets are derived from the same master data set. **Violations may occur due to customization errors, data entry errors, program errors, etc.**

Therefore, it is clear that although a single transaction may trigger the recording of data in two separate databases, it does not necessarily follow that the recorded data will be identical as various error sources can cause the recorded data to become mismatched (whether when initially recorded or over time during separate and independent maintenance of each database). Further, even if the recorded data in each separate database is identical and remains so over time, the present invention has utility in that an aspect of the present invention allows verification that the separately maintained and stored data is indeed identical as desired. Accordingly, these claims have patentable

utility. Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of all outstanding § 101 rejections.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1-5, 8, 10, 12-16, 19, 22-26, 29, 31, 33-37 and 40 stand rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kucala (Pub. No. US2001/0016853A1) in view of Klein (U.S. Pat. No. 5,404,509). Claims 43-47 and 50-51 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Kucala in view of Klein and further in view of Putnam (Pub. No. US2003/0208405A1). Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1, 12, 19, 22, 33, 40 and 43 because the cited art fails to teach or suggest all elements of these claims

For example, claim 1 recites:

storing to memory a reconciliation report, wherein the reconciliation report presents data for selected fields of the first and second data sources, and further **automatically** provides a **first predefined indication** if data for corresponding fields are matched and a **second predefined indication** if data for corresponding fields are not matched.

Neither Kucala nor Klein nor Putnam teaches or suggests this subject matter. In an aspect of the present invention, corresponding data from selected fields of first and second data sources are presented to a user. A first predefined indication can be automatically displayed to clearly show which corresponding fields are matched (e.g., an equal to sign) while a second predefined indication can be automatically displayed to clearly show which corresponding fields are not matched (e.g., a not equal to sign). This feature of the present invention is depicted in Figure 4 (reproduced herein with labels added).

Reconciliation Analysis: BL Resource to BCS entry documents 9000

Subtotal / Fund / Period	BL Res. 9000	bcs entry 9000	Difference
Total	35.378.300,00	35.378.310,00	10,00-
APPORTIONMENTS AVAILABLE	326.584.140,00-	326.584.140,00-	
0100DA-02	291.450.060,00-	291.450.060,00-	
0100DB-02	8.000.000,00	8.000.000,00	
0101-0203	39.000.000,00-	39.000.000,00-	
0105-X	16.000.000,00	16.000.000,00	
0200D-X	20.000.080,00-	20.000.080,00-	
4050-X	134.000,00-	134.000,00-	
APPORTIONMENTS UNAVAILABLE	10,00-	0,00	10,00-
0100DA-02	10,00-	0,00	10,00-
01	10,00-	0,00	10,00-

second predefined indication

first predefined indication

The graphical symbols used to indicate matches and mismatches are automatically presented and can be predefined so that a user is not required to compare fields and to flag or indicate matched or mismatched data (or to calculate any difference thereof) himself.

The Office Action admits that Kucala does not teach or suggest this feature of the present invention. Applicants contend that the deficiency of Kucala is not cured by Klein or by Putnam. In particular, in contrast to an aspect of the present invention, Klein requires a user to determine/evaluate discrepancies between database records. Further, discrepancies between records must be indicated/flagged by the user and are based on the size or amount of the discrepancy. Therefore, the indication used to flag mismatched data varies with each compared data pair. Col. 18, line 66 through col. 19, lines 21 of Klein describes the burden placed on a user to determine and quantify data discrepancies:

The user 116 then compares the image with the contents of the corresponding database record for each record in the sample. In step 224, the user 116 notes any discrepancies on the audit summary screen 800. The user 116 records each discrepancy in a slot corresponding to the field where it occurred.

If, on the other hand, there are no electronic images that represent the source material for the database 114, then the reviewing sample utility 128 conducts the review by generating reports as follows. It prints a set of reports that essentially provide the on-line information available presented on the audit summary screen 1200 and on the sample record review screen 800. The reports include a List of Random Records Report, a Record Contents Report, a Comparison Report and an Error Recording Form.

The List of Random Records Report is a listing of the records that comprise the sample. This list is used to retrieve the source material using just a few key descriptor fields taken from the database 114. The Record Contents Report is a listing of the complete contents of the records that comprise the sample. **The Comparison Report is the same as the Record Contents Report, with extra space to enter corrections, if necessary.**

It is therefore clear that neither Kucala nor Klein teaches or suggest "storing to memory a reconciliation report, wherein the reconciliation report presents data for selected fields of the first and second data sources, and further automatically provides a first predefined indication if data for corresponding fields are matched and a second predefined indication if data for corresponding fields are not matched" as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable. Further, claims 2-5 and 8-11 are allowable for at least the reasons stated above and based on their dependence from claim 1.

Independent claims 12, 19, 22, 33, 40 and 43 are allowable for at least the reasons provided above with respect to independent claim 1. Claims 13-16 depend from claim 12, claims 23-26 and 29-32 depend from claim 22, claims 34-37 depend from claim 33, and claims 44-47 and 50-51 depend from claim 43 and thus are allowable as well.

New claims 52-63 further define the automatically presented first and second predefined indications recited in the independent claims. These claims are allowable as depending from allowable independent claims as well as due to the recited features therein.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests entry of the above amendments and favorable action in connection with this application. The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or 1.17 to Kenyon & Kenyon LLP Deposit Account No. 11-0600. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (202) 220-4235 to discuss any matter concerning this application.

All claims are allowable. Allowance is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 20, 2007

/Wesley W. Jones/
Wesley W. Jones
(Reg. No. 56,552)

KENYON & KENYON LLP
1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: (202) 220-4200
Facsimile: (202) 220-4201